



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/667,315

09/23/2003

Takashi Yamamoto

03500.017622.

9264

5514

7590

10/20/2008

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER

PARRA, OMAR S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2421

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/20/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/667,315	Applicant(s) YAMAMOTO ET AL.	
	Examiner OMAR PARRA	Art Unit 2421	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 July 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 10, 16-23 and 25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 10, 16-23 and 25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>04/29/2008</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 07/01/2008 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims **1-8, 10, 16-23 and 25** have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims **1-8, 10, 16-23 and 25** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rodriguez et al. (hereinafter 'Rodriguez', Pub. No. 2003/0002862) in view of Griggs (Pub. No. 2008/0077960) in further view of Murase et al. (hereinafter 'Murase', Pub. No. 2004/0083301).

Regarding claims 1 and 16, Rodriguez teaches a receiving apparatus **(DHCT 16, Fig. 4)** (with respective method) comprising:

a reception unit **(442, Fig. 4)** constructed to receive content data and content list data via a network, the content list data including information, which includes a content name, for specifying each of a plurality of receivable contents data on the receiving apparatus **([0048]; [0050]-[0051]; [0061]; [0063]; [0070]-[0071]; where, every content data includes a content name –a title- for specifying each of a plurality of receivable contents);**

a content processing unit **(processor 444 in conjunction with 443, Fig. 4)** constructed to process the content data received by the reception unit to generate video and audio data **([0062]-[0063]);**

a generating unit **(PRM or other application executed at processor 444)** constructed to generate a content list based on the content list data received by the reception unit, for displaying the content name of each of the plurality of receivable contents data in a list format **([0051]; [0070]-[0071]; [0081]-[0083]; where a list of available content names –titles- is displayed, 2173, Fig. 21);**

an output unit **(448, Fig. 4; [0062]; Figs. 18-27, which are outputs of both video and content list received)** constructed to output the content list generated by the generating unit, and the video and audio data to a display apparatus **(441; Fig. 4);**

wherein the generating unit generates the content list which relates link information of each content data to the content name of each so as to display information as to the estimated time in relation to the information for specifying the content data **(On Fig. 21, button 2176 links the highlighted content name of the content list with another generated screen that displays linking information, sections 10 of Figs. 22-26, that includes the estimated times for the chosen content name. This will work the same for all and every one of the titles of the content list).**

On the other hand, although Rodriguez teaches generating a list of receivable content names and linking information between the content name and its estimated download time, Rodriguez does not explicitly teach that the content list displays all the content names available and their respective estimated time in a list all together and that link information is associated to a ranking indicating easiness of connection based on the estimated time.

However, in an analogous art, Griggs teaches an electronic guide displays all the content available for a user, from all the content providers and with respective download times; all in a single display (300, Fig. 3; [0005]-[0011]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to have modified Rodriguez's invention with Griggs' feature of showing all the titles from all the content providers and with respective download times for the benefit of not having the user going back and forth between different screens for every content name for just to know the downloading time of different titles.

Additionally, the combined teachings of Rodriguez and Griggs do not explicitly teach that the content list and its link information are associated to a ranking indication easiness of connection based on the estimated time.

However, the examiner takes Official Notice that it is well known in the art of presenting listings of contents to user to associate them to a ranking (position in the list) or sort them based on a given concept: alphabetical order, based on displayed elements such as duration, download or response time, time of creation, etc.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to an ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Rodriguez and Griggs with the well known feature of associating listing of contents to the displayed element of download or response time for the benefit of informing the user, in an ordered manner, how much time it would take him/her to download from fastest (first position) to the slowest (last in the list) or vice versa.

Rodriguez and Griggs teach that the displayed content list information displayed on the content list (including the estimated download time) is sent from the server (where the estimation and monitoring of the network is performed by a section of the headend; Rodriguez: 323, Fig. 3; [0052]-[0053]). Rodriguez and Griggs also teach that the functionalities of the server and client are interchangeable (Rodriguez: [0061]), which implies or suggests that the client is also able to perform the network monitoring functionality by itself. On the other hand, Rodriguez and Griggs do not explicitly teach that the displayed estimated time is performed by the receiving device.

However, in an analogous art, Murase teaches a receiving apparatus (Client terminals 3, Fig. 1) with the capability of dynamically monitoring the network and estimate a time for obtaining pieces of content and for the time needed for processing and displaying the video. Connection time $t(n)$ -sending and receiving time, and decompressing time $c(n)$ is established or detected, to calculate the buffering time for the consecutive display of the content, [0062]-[0079], [0088], [0097]-[0099]. Video is displayed when the buffering time –which is the calculated with the estimation of the times explained before, expires.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to an ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Rodriguez and Griggs' invention with the receiving device feature of monitoring and estimating the time for presentation as taught by Murase for the benefit of having a dynamic estimation of the time a user has to wait until the video is ready for display instead of an estimation performed before the moment of ordering the content without considering current network characteristics or for the benefit of relieving the server of estimating a download time for all the clients.

Regarding claims 2 and 17, the combined teachings of Rodriguez, Griggs and Murase teach a receiving apparatus (with respective method) wherein the control unit detects at least one of a first time required for a procedure for connecting to a distribution source of the content data and a second time required for receiving a predetermined amount of the content data (**Murase: Connection time $t(n)$ -sending and receiving time, and decompressing time**

Art Unit: 2421

c(n) is established or detected, to calculate the buffering time for the consecutive display of the content, [0062]-[0079], [0088], [0097]-[0099].

Video is displayed when the buffering time –which is the calculated with the estimation of the times explained before, expires), and

the generating unit generates information as to at least one of the first time and the second time or a total time of the first time and the second time in relation to the information for the content name of each content data **(Rodriguez: Figs. 22-26, where estimated time is displayed to the user on section10 of each figure. Different download times are/were estimated and displayed to the user: 2.5 min when the download is marked as immediate, Fig. 25; 62.5 min when marked as 'complete in 1 hour'; and inherently, 122.5 min when marked 'complete in 2 hours', Fig. 22).**

Regarding claims 3 and 18, the combined teachings of Rodriguez, Griggs and Murase teach a receiving apparatus (with respective method) wherein the control unit compares the detected times with a predetermined threshold value **(Murase: For each stream, the connection time and the processing time have to be less than the previous displaying time -[0066]; [0090], and for that reason, the buffering time is used as a threshold to check if the reception and processing has been performed, [0097]-[0099]. If it was, normal display of a/v content follows; while an error is detected if the opposite happens, [0118]), and**

the generating unit generates the content list controls the output means so as to display a result of the comparison **(Rodriguez: Different download times are estimated/displayed to the user: 2.5 min when the download is marked as immediate, Fig. 25; 62.5 min when marked as 'complete in 1 hour'; and inherently, 122.5 min when marked 'complete in 2 hours', Fig. 22).**

Regarding claims 4 and 19, the combined teachings of Rodriguez, Griggs and Murase teach a receiving apparatus (with respective method) wherein the control unit compares the detected times with plural threshold values, which are different from each other **(Murase: Given that the buffering time is calculated iteratively for every stream, their values change due to different factors, and therefore different values of buffering times are used to compare, [0102]. Rodriguez: Different download times are/were estimated and displayed to the user: 2.5 min when the download is marked as immediate, Fig. 25; 62.5 min when marked as 'complete in 1 hour'; and inherently, 122.5 min when marked 'complete in 2 hours', Fig. 22).**

Regarding claims 5 and 20, the combined teachings of Rodriguez, Griggs and Murase teach a receiving apparatus (with respective method) wherein the control unit controls the reception unit so as to execute processing for connection to a distribution destination of the content data and detects the first time and the second time based upon the processing for connection **(Given that a buffering time is iteratively calculated for consecutive streams, connection and**

Art Unit: 2421

processing times are estimated sequentially, [0062]-[0079], [0088], [0097]-[0099] [0102])..

Regarding claims 6 and 21, the combined teachings of Rodriguez, Griggs and Murase teach a receiving apparatus (with respective method) wherein the control unit judges that reception is impossible in the case in which a time required for a procedure for connection to a distribution destination of the content data has exceeded a predetermined time **(Murase: It is inherent, that if no data is decompressed or received, no video will be displayed. Therefore, if the buffering time is exceeded and if the previous displayed time is over, no video will be shown as an indication of the error, [0118])**, and

the generating unit generates the content list including information indicating that the reception is impossible **(Rodriguez: Fig. 31)**.

Regarding claims 7 and 22, the combined teachings of Rodriguez, Griggs and Murase teach a receiving apparatus (with respective method) wherein the control unit judges that reception is impossible in the case in which a time required for a procedure for receiving a predetermined amount of the content data has exceeded a predetermined time **(Murase: It is inherent, that if no data is decompressed or received, no video will be displayed. Therefore, if the buffering time is exceeded and if the previous displayed time is over, no video will be shown as an indication of the error, [0118])**, and

the generating unit generates the content list including information indicating that the reception is impossible (**Rodriguez: Fig. 31**).

Regarding claims 8 and 23, the combined teachings of Rodriguez, Griggs and Murase teach a receiving apparatus (with respective method) wherein the reception unit is capable of receiving N pieces of the content data in parallel with each other, and the control unit detects the time for the N pieces of the content data in parallel with each other, which are received by the reception unit means in parallel with each other among the plural content data (**Murase: [0041]. Rodriguez: 210, 220, 230 and 240, Fig. 2; [0044]-[0048]**).

Regarding claims 10 and 25, the combined teachings of Rodriguez, Griggs and Murase teach a receiving apparatus (with respective method) wherein the reception unit has a storage unit which is capable of storing a predetermined amount of the N pieces of the content data, respectively, and the control unit controls the reception unit so as to store the predetermined N pieces of the content data among the plural content data in the storage unit (**413, Fig. 4; [0070]; [0077]-[0078] ; [0083]**).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to OMAR PARRA whose telephone number is (571)270-1449. The examiner can normally be reached on 9-6 PM (M-F, every other Friday off).

Art Unit: 2421

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John W. Miller can be reached on 571-272-7353. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/John W. Miller/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2421

OP